

The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

At No. 23, Notre Dame Street, by

J. GILLES.

G. E. OLBERG, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year...

We beg to remind our correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless prepaid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 17.

ECCLÉSIASTICAL CALENDAR.

MARCH—1865.

Friday, 17—St. PATRICK, Ap. of Ireland, Holy Sweet. Saturday, 18—St. Gabriel, Arch. Sunday, 19—THIRD OF LENT, FEAST OF ST. JOSEPH. Monday, 20—St. Patrick, D. Tuesday, 21—St. Benedict. Wednesday, 22—Of the Feria. Thursday, 23—Of the Feria.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

The funeral of the late Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster took place on Thursday, 23rd ult., with a pomp without a parallel in the annals of England...

Never since the great apostasy, known in history as the Reformation, has such a scene been witnessed in England as that which presented itself on that Thursday.

In the House of Lords there has been a lively and most significant debate on the subject of "Canadian Defences," to which the publication of the Report of Col. Jervis has directed general attention.

and that is that it must be got rid of as an incumbrance; honorably if possible, but got rid of at any price. This is why the policy of the Brown-Carter Ministry is so favorably looked upon in England...

The absurd proposal to lay out £200,000 in the course of four years on the Quebec fortifications, and to leave Canada to do all the rest of the work needful for waging a defensive war...

The passage of the Encyclical to which in the above extract from the Colonel's speech allusion is evidently made, is the second clause of the tenth section of the accompanying Syllabus—wherein the following proposition is marked out for condemnation:—"78. Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam Catholicis nominis Belgicis lege cautum est, ut hominibus illis immigratis licet publicum proprii cuiusquod cultus exercitium habeat."

There is little of importance to be found in the European Continental news. The report of the Federal victory over General Early seems now to have been grossly exaggerated. On the other hand we have had rumors of Federal defeats; but it is certain that no decisive action has been fought, or any successes gained for which either party can pretend to sing a Te Deum.

No immediate results need be feared from the vote of our Provincial Parliament ratifying the acts of the Quebec delegates, since the Lower Province are now strongly averse to the proposed Union; and it is not probable that, on this head, the sentiments of the people will undergo any great change.

"That the Catholics in Upper Canada be placed upon the same footing respecting educational privileges as the Protestants of Lower Canada." "Years 20. Nays 85.

We leave our Catholic friends of the Upper Province to ponder over the significance of these figures, and thence to calculate their chances of obtaining justice, or a favorable hearing for their claims.

His Lordship the Bishop of St. Hyacinthe has issued a Pastoral Letter to all the faithful of his Diocese, publishing the late Papal Encyclical, and the annexed Syllabus.

No judgment has as yet been delivered in the case of the St. Alban Raiders.

COL. HAULTAIN AND THE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL.—"Ne sutor ultra crepidam," is a somewhat trite proverb, yet may we be excused for recalling it to the memory of the gallant colonel, and erudite legislator whose name appears above.

Col. Haultain, in the course of his discussion on the Union scheme before the country, expressed his apprehensions that the Protestant minority of Lower Canada might be thereby exposed to unjust treatment from the Catholic majority; and he sought to justify these apprehensions from the essentially intolerant character of the "Romish Hierarchy," of which intolerance the Pope, in his late Encyclical had himself set an example:—"He, Col. Haultain, would refer on this point to

the late Encyclical Letter from Rome as an answer to the question put him. He saw by that document issued with the authority that surrounded a message from the Pope to the Roman Catholic Church...

Col. Haultain will pardon us for assuring him that he has seen no such thing; that he has not seen the Encyclical with its Syllabus, but at best only an imperfect translation of that document furnished by the newspapers...

The passage of the Encyclical to which in the above extract from the Colonel's speech allusion is evidently made, is the second clause of the tenth section of the accompanying Syllabus—wherein the following proposition is marked out for condemnation:—

Of which we offer the following translation:—"Thus it is commendable that, in certain Catholic countries, it has been provided by law that foreigners coming there should enjoy the public exercise of their particular religious rites."

We beg of Col. Haultain to note the words which we have italicized—"lege cautum est," and "publicum"—as on these in great part the meaning of the, to him, obnoxious paragraph depends; and to bear in mind that it is one thing for a State calling itself Christian and Catholic, to tolerate, or not by law to prohibit, freedom of worship to foreigners within its jurisdiction...

God knows they had little cause to sing or to be glad. At the best, to the Catholics and to the French Canadians, the Union proposed by the Brown-Carter Ministry can only appear as a painful but necessary alternative, forced upon them by the unfortunate position to which they have been driven.

We will suppose that Col. Haultain is a member of the Church of England; if so would he not treat as an error the proposition that the British Government would do well to provide by law for the public exercise of the religious rites even of all its subjects—seeing that of those subjects many are plunged in grossest idolatry? Much more then is Great Britain as a Christian State not bound, or rather bound not, to provide by law for the public exercise of their religious rites by all foreigners who may happen to come within its jurisdiction.

Col. Haultain may be sure that the words used by the Sovereign Pontiff in his late Encyclical, were scrupulously selected, and carefully weighed before they were given to the world; and that if it had been the intention of the Pope to condemn as erroneous, the proposition "that emigrants to Catholic countries should have freedom of worship"—or in other words, should not be prevented by law from worshipping God after their own fashion...

Modern Liberalism of which the error condemned by the Pope in Art. 78, is the offspring, holds indeed, that all religions are entitled to equal provision from the State, because all are equally "true," or in other words are equally "false."

or false religions, should by chance the professors of any of those false religious systems happen to take up their residence within the limits of the jurisdiction of the said State. It might indeed refuse to interfere, to put down or suppress any of these false religions; but it could not make legal provision for their public exercise, without thereby making abnegation of its Christian character.

And so the Protestant Government of England, applying this principle, and carrying it further than does the Pope, not only makes no legal provision for the public exercise of their religion by its Catholic subjects in England, but it positively, and by law, makes in many instances, an offence punishable by the civil magistrate. So too, wherever Protestants are in power the public exercise of the Catholic religion is virtually prohibited, if not by statute law, at all events by mob law, from which there is no appeal.

On the morning of the 10th instant, after a long debate extending over several weeks, the Ministry by a clever appeal to Parliamentary tactics, known as moving the "previous question," forced on a division on their Union scheme. It was carried by a large majority, and the members dispersed "singing;" so the journals tell us.

Neither can we perceive any practical difference between the Brown-Carter Union policy just adopted, and that of the Brown-Dixon Cabinet, which we in common with our soi-disant Conservative brethren of the press, had the honor of opposing a few years ago, as ruinous to the autonomy of Lower Canada.

History nevertheless furnishes us with several instances of short-sighted mortals singing then, when they should have wept. So Made. de Stael tells us how on the 4th of May, 1789, she sat at an open window at Versailles in company with Made. Montmorin, gazing on the gorgeous spectacle presented by the procession of the States General, then on their way to Church to assist at a solemn High Mass...

In a day or two Mr. Scott called upon me again stating that, having consulted his friends, he acceded to my objections, and would propose to amend the Bill accordingly. I replied that I still objected to any other party than the Government conducting a measure of that kind through the Legislature...

doubt deemed to be the triumph of her father's policy, and a pledge that his power as Minister should long continue. "You do wrong to rejoice," said Made. Montmorin with prophetic insight to her companion; "you do greatly wrong to be glad and to rejoice; for this bodes great misfortunes to France and to ourselves."

DR. RYERSON AND FINALITY.

When in 1863, under the Macdonald-Sicotte Ministry, the reforms in the School Law for which the Catholics had so long contended in vain, were in part accorded, a great discussion arose as to the "finality" of the measure...

It would be highly imprudent to accept of it as a full and final settlement of the School Question. We trust that it may prove to be so; but before we accept it as such, we must give it a fair trial, and see how it works.

Again on the 3rd of April of the same year we expressed ourselves in the same guarded manner, when replying to an article in the Globe complaining that the Romish Clergy had not accepted Mr. Scott's Bill as final:—

"But without presumption we may assert that the Bishops and Clergy of Canada are prepared to accept Mr. Scott's Bill as a final settlement of the question, provided only that, after a fair trial, it shall be found to secure the objects for which the School agitation was commenced."

So much with regard to the action of the Catholic laity, and their recognised organ of the press, whose reiterated demands for further reforms in the Separate School Law have provoked an indignant pamphlet from the Rev. Mr. Ryerson, Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada, and from the Toronto Globe.

The former affirms in his pamphlet that he consented to allow Mr. Scott's emasculated School Bill to pass without opposition on his part, only upon the express condition, agreed to betwixt him and the ecclesiastical authorities, that the Bill should be final. In support of this pretension the Rev. Mr. Ryerson gives the following particulars:—

"In a day or two Mr. Scott called upon me again stating that, having consulted his friends, he acceded to my objections, and would propose to amend the Bill accordingly. I replied that I still objected to any other party than the Government conducting a measure of that kind through the Legislature; but as he removed from the Bill what I considered objectionable, I would waive my objections on his proceeding with the Bill, and would aid him to get it passed, on two conditions:—First, that it should be assented to on the part of the Government, and therefore passed on their responsibility; and secondly, that it should be accepted by the authorities of the Church as a final settlement of the question."